The University of Chicago

THE PHILOSOPHY OF
ŚRĪ JĪVA GOSWĀMI
(VAIṢṆAVA VEDĀNTA OF THE BENGAL SCHOOL)

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
1937

By
MAHANAM BRATA BRAHMACHARI

THE INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDENTS
FOR THE STUDY OF HUMAN RELATIONS
BRENT HOUSE, 5540 WOODLAWN AVENUE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1937

The University of Chicago

THE PHILOSOPHY OF
ŚRĪ JĪVA GOSWĀMI
(VAIṢṆAVA VEDĀNTA OF THE BENGAL SCHOOL)

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
1937

By
MAHANAM BRATA BRAHMACHARI

THE INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDENTS
FOR THE STUDY OF HUMAN RELATIONS
Brent House, 5540 Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Illinois
1937

FOREWORD

This booklet is a brief synopsis of a part of my doctorate dissertation, submitted to the University of Chicago. The kindly interest of Mrs. George Biller, the Director of the Institute of Oriental Students, has made this publication possible. To her, to my professors and to my friends: Dr. E. S. Ames, Dr. C. W. Morris, Dr. C. Hartshorne, Dr. and Mrs. H. Hille, Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Propson, Mrs. J. H. Robbins, Mr. C. F. Weller, Mr. D. V. Stranden, Mrs. L. Hoit, Mr. C. Passialis, Mr. R. Walsh, Mr. K. Hatter, Mr. H. Das and others—too many to enumerate—but for whose loving care and kindness my entire career in the University of Chicago would remain a fruitless plan, I owe something which is too deep for words to communicate. To thank one's dear ones is an un-Indian custom; to be able to repay by any means an act of kindliness is more than a wandering monk like myself can ever hope. Only a few words I utter and that I do from the core of my heart: May the Lord bless you all! Jai Jagad Bandhu!! Peace!!!

MAHANAM BRATA BRAHMACHARI
("Sriangan" Monastery
Faridpur, India)

Brent House
Convocation Sunday
Summer, 1937

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

THE PHILOSOPHY OF ŚRĪ JĪVA GOSWĀMI

(VAIṢṆAVA VEDĀNTA OF THE BENGAL SCHOOL)

INTRODUCTION

I. THE LIFE AND WORKS OF SRI JIVA GOSWAMI

Śrī Jīva Goswāmi, the greatest of the expounders of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, flourished from the middle of the 16th to the beginning of the 17th century of the Christian era. Bengal Vaiṣṇavism or Gouḍiya Vaiṣṇavism, as it is usually called, is a religious movement inaugurated by the Lord Chaitanya (1485-1533) who is one of the greatest prophets of Hindu Religion and is worshipped today by millions as an Incarnation of God Himself on earth. The message of the Lord Chaitanya was propagated by six illustrious disciples. They are well known as the "Saḍ-Goswāmi" or Six Apostles. The names of these apostles are Śrī Rupa, Sanātana, Raghu Nāth Dās, Raghu Nāth Bhatta, Gopāl Bhatta and Śrī Jīva Goswāmi.

Śrī Jīva is usually called the founder of the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta of the Bengal School, although he was rather an expounder of it. The school has a long history extending, as we mentioned, from the Lord Chaitanya to the present day. The worthy disciples and followers of Śrī Jīva such as Kriṣṇadās (contemporary of Śrī Jīva), Baladeva (17th century), Viśvanāth (18th century), Bābā Bhārati (19th century), and others, have accelerated the influence of their master throughout the centuries.

Most of the works of the philosophers of this school are in Sanskrit and Bengali. Some of the works of Baladeva are available in English translation. The major work of Śrī Jīva is known as "Sat Sandarbha" which means six treatises on philosophy. They are as follows:

1. Discourses on Truth. (Tattva Sandarbha)
2. Discourses on God. (Bhāgavata Sandarbha)
3. Discourses on the Absolute. (Paramātma Sandarbha)
4. Discourses on Devotion. (Bhakti Sandarbha)
5. Discourses on Love. (Prīti Sandarbha)
6. Discourses on the Lord Kriṣṇa. (Kriṣṇa Sandarbha)

Later on, Śrī Jīva himself summarized these six discourses into one treatise called by him "Summation of all messages" (Sarva Saṁvādinī).

In the following pages we consider the philosophy of Śrī Jīva Goswāmi and his school.

II. ORIENTATION

Philosophers are so much a part of their culture that it is almost an impossible task to consider them in isolation. As the philosophy of Kant is scarcely intelligible unless we consider how it arose out of the Leibnitz-Wolffian rationalism and the Humean scepticism, so, in analogous fashion, the part that Śrī Jīva Goswāmi played in Indian thought is not adequately appreciable unless we are acquainted with the stage and the background set up by the quietistic mysticism of Śaṅkara and the realistic theism of Rāmānuja.

All the Vedāntists—Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Śrī Jīva, and their followers—inherited the fundamental doctrine of their philosophies from their revealed scriptures known as the Upaniṣads, the validity of which they never questioned or criticized. That doctrine is this: The ultimate reality underlying the universe is consciousness (chaitanya). It is called Brahman (the Absolute) or Ātman (the Self).

Now, Śaṅkara maintains that consciousnecc is the fundamental reality because it can never be denied, since its very denial presupposes its existence. From this principle follows that which can be denied is not ultimately real. Śaṅkara recognizes that everything in the universe can be denied and hence he declares unhesitatingly that everything in the universe, save consciousness, is unreal. Pure consciousness which is absolute, impersonal, homogeneous, non-relational and unqualified is the eternal and immutable reality. It is static—motionless and changeless. The objective universe with all its individualities and manifold changeable substances is nothing but mere falsification of the fundamental reality.

Rāmānuja, on the other hand, holds that if consciousness is real it must reveal its own characteristics. As no experience is possible without a subject-object relation, and no object of experience is devoid of quality or individuality, the fundamental reality must have individuality and quality and that must allow relation, modification and change within it. The reality, for Rāmānuja, therefore is the Absolute Being, who is an individual of innumerable auspicious qualities. He has two modes, one he calls intelligent and the other non-intelligent—very similar to "thought" and "extension" of Spinoza. For Śaṅkara, all individualities are the falsification of the Absolute Consciousness whereas for Rāmānuja, they are the genuinely real modes of the Absolute Being, who is a living dynamic Personality of Supreme Intelligence. Purely static homogeneous consciouness, which Śaṅkara calls ultimately real, is, to the estimation of Rāmānuja, a mere figment of imagination. What is "appearance" to Śaṅkara is thus "reality" to Rāmānuja. What is reality to Śaṅkara is a fiction to Rāmānuja. But curiously enough, both cling to the Upaniṣadic doctrine that ultimate reality is consciousness. These, therefore, are not two philosophies of two philosophers but two antagonistic interpretations of one and the same tradition. Śrī Jīva tries to read his tradition correctly by accepting the positive contributions of both his predecessors.

CHAPTER I

THE PHILOSOPHY OF SRĪ JĪVA GOSWĀMI

I. THE APPROACH OF SRI JIVA

Śrī Jīva, in common with all other Vedāntists, accepts the fundamental principle of the Upaniṣads, namely, that essential reality can be equated with consciousness (chaitanya). Consciousness is real and the truly real. But why is consciousness real, is the question Śrī Jīva asks himself. Śaṅkara says that consciousness is real because it cannot be denied, because it is never sublated. The contention of Śaṅkara is true since the denial of consciousness involves its existence. But it is a question whether this is the reason why consciousness is fundamental. Śrī Jīva does not think so. He admits the truth of the fact that consciousness is undeniable and is never sublated but he hestitates to uphold this fact as an adequate reason for the essential reality of consciousness. To him, the fact that an entity cannot be denied seems to be something which is extraneous to that entity. There must, he thinks, be some factor intrinsic to consciousness which makes it undeniable. Undeniability is rather a negative way of describing the nature of a thing. The fact that makes the negative description possible must be something positive which constitutes the very nature of the thing of which negative description is made. Śrī Jīva seeks to find out what that positive something is which makes consciousness undeniable.

Rāmānuja says that consciousness can be denied, and he can deny his own very easily. Rāmānuja's argument for this contention is that objects of consciousness need not necessarily be contemporary to the consciousness that knows them. Rāmānuja seems to miss the real point of the argument. The question is not whether somebody can deny his individual existence but whether consciousness can be an object of denial by anything except consciousness. Furthermore, denial of some entity does not simply mean that one can say that that entity does not exist; what is meant by the denial of some entity is that one has to be conscious of the non-existence of that entity. Whether that entity is contemporary to consciousness or not is irrelevant to the argument. Since denial means to be conscious of the fact of non-existence, the only entity that can never be denied would be consciousness itself. To Śrī Jīva, this fact of undeniability of consciousness is due to something inherent in it. The essential nature of consciousness must be such as makes its denial impossible.

Rāmānuja maintains that all that is revealed by consciousness is real since consciousness itself is real. Śrī Jīva accepts the truth of the fact that all that is revealed or illumined by consciousness is real but he considers the reason given by Rāmānuja as inadequate. Consciousness is real but it may very well reveal something which is unreal. As a matter of fact it does reveal unreal phenomena, otherwise how do we speak about unreal things at all? Unless consciousness and the realities that it reveals have certain internal relationship, the reality of one can not make the other real, and this relation must be due to the essential nature of consciousness .

Rāmānuja has also told us that not only what is revealed by consciousness but also what is revealed within consciousness itself, is real, and this is true, since consciousness itself is real. On this point also, Śrī Jīva accepts the fact but considers the reason incomplete. That which is revealed within consciousness can be real only if some thing very essential in consciousness is responsible for making it so.

What is this essence of consciousness? Śrī Jīva approaches in terms of three positions. Firstly, that consciousness is undeniable; secondly, that what is revealed by it is real; and thirdly, that what is revealed within it is real. From every point he returns back with the same message that there should be something intrinsic in consciousness that accounts for all these facts. No sensible person doubts the facts of his consciousness, but what is the reason for this lack of doubt? This inquiry of Śrī Jīva amounts to admitting that consciousness with all its data is real but asking why this is so. He seeks for the answer to his question in the Upaniṣads and finds it suggested in the Śvetāśvatara Upansiṣad (vi. 8). The answer of Śrī Jīva to this question consists of one word, on which hangs his whole system: "Power" (*Śakti*). (Power is not a good word for the technical term Śakti. I intend to capitalize the word Power in order to indicate, at least to Sanskrit students, that I mean by it "Śakti").

II. POWER OF CONSCIOUSNESS AND ITS ANALYSIS

The supreme principle and ultimate substance is consciousness and this consciousness has "Power." Śrī Jīva sets himself to the task of finding out the nature of this Power.

The Power of Consciousness is said to be "Will" (*Icchā*). Three kinds of will are recognized: the will-to-do, the will-to-know and the will -to-enjoy (*kriyā, jñāna,* and *ānanda*). They find expressions in action, knowledge and joy of life. In every mode of expression of our life one of these predominates while the other two are subservient. One mode stands for active sense life, another for intellectual life and another for emotional life according as one or other is viewed as dominant with the two other as subservient. Notice is drawn toward two points. (1) These three modes are inseparable. (2) In different moments of our life one of them finds predominant expression. Their inseparability is proved by the fact that none of them can be understood to stand by itself. We work to know, we work to feel the pleasures of life, we work to express ourselves in the actions of life. To know is to exist and feel happy, to exist is to know and be happy and to be happy is to possess knowledge and feel existence. This shows that will-power itself constitutes a unity. It is neither *to do,* nor *to know,* nor *to enjoy* alone, but *all* of them in one and the same moment. This unity of will-power is the essential power of consciousness and it is technically called by Śrī Jīva the "Innermost or Primary Power" of consciousness (*Antarangā or Svarupā Śakti*).

Consciousness is a unity. But it is also true that one or other of those modes seeks manifestation in different situations of life. From this fact Śrī Jīva comes to the conclusion that consciousness has another

power. By one power it is what it is in itself—a unity, by another power it manifests itself variously, each manifestation being partial. This latter power he calls the "Intermediary or Radiating Power" (*Tatasthā Śakti*) of consciousness. It is so named since another third power of consciousness is also recognized, which is designated "Secondary or Outermost Power" (*Bahirangā Śakti*) of consciousness. What this is we shall discuss presently.

When the "Intermediary Power" of consciousness expresses itself it does it in a definite way, and when that particular way is repeated a number of times a sort of habit is formed. Thus when any mode of life becomes habitual it acquires a new status. Deliberate choices and decisions become less and less necessary in the exercise of those habit patterns. We eat and drink and walk and talk and even think almost unknowingly. These activities have become comparatively independent of the Primary and Intermediary Power. This is the function of the Outermost or Secondary Power of consciousness.

The relationship between these three powers are peculiar. The "Intermediary Power" can not function at all without the initiative of the "Primary Power," since in the latter the former is rooted. But the habitual or "Secondary Power" can move on indefinitely without the help of the others. Secondary Power, to be sure, can not act unless the unity of consciousness is back of it, but the latter does not play any active role in the functioning of the Secondary Power. It seems to take care of itself by developing a definite course of action of its own. We may say in a sense that Secondary Power does work more or less automatically. It acts neither with mathematical precision nor at random. It is a semi-regular automatic machine. It is called "outermost" since it is removed or farther from the center of consciousness which is the seat of Primary Power. The Secondary Power depends on the Primary Power in that the former would cease to function if the latter were not there. Primary Power is therefore a sort of superintendent, onlooker or "witness," in the language of Vedānta. The Secondary Power depends on the Intermediary Power in that the former initially owes its origin directly to the latter. But when once it has acquired its existence and power, it is free from both the other functions. All the aggregated instincts and impulses that we possess are the expressions of the Secondary Power of Consciousness. All our conscious thinking, acting and feeling are due to the Intermediary Power. Behind these two Powers stands the Primary Power of consciousness which is a unity.

Now, the question arises whether the Primary Power can ever be experienced or its existence is merely an hypothesis. When we try to study a conscious individual, be it others or ourselves, what is it with which we first come in contact? It is the expressions of one's Intermediary Power. At different times, in different situations and varied environments, we know an individual as a doer or knower or enjoyer. Within particular and finite surroundings, the Intermediary Power of Consciousness finds different ways of manifesting a part of the whole of the unit-self. Except for the Intermediary Power we could never know a person, but it is also true that the Intermediary Power conceals the

whole individual from our view. The whole is a unity and it always stands at the back of every phase, but by virtue of the fact that Intermediary Power is partial, it can never adequately manifest the whole of the unity. The intimate individuality of a person is always hidden from our view. We are always hidden in ourselves like a truth hidden in isolated facts. Is there any way of knowing the whole? This is important because unless the nature of that unity is known the true character of consciousness can not be revealed. The expressions of the Intermediary Power of consciousness that we come across seem to constitute what we usually call an empirical ego. If this were all that exists, then there would not be any hidden thing which we would need to look for. In that case the whole and the part would be on the same level, such as a forest and the trees. The trees go to make a forest and the forest is the collection of trees. But because it is held that consciousness is a unity and not an aggregate of various modes, the question is very legitimately asked whether there is any way of realizing or experiencing that so-called Primary Power of consciousness which makes the self a unity.

The answer of Śrī Jīva to this question is in the affirmative. The reason would be something like the following: what conceals the unity of consciousness from our view is nothing but its own Intermediary Power. The Intermediary Power, however, does not possess any inherent intention to hide the nature of its original source. It does it nevertheless in spite of itself. The concealment is really due to the fact that the Intermediary Power is usually directed towards something finite and particular. It is only when our conscious cognition or volition are directed towards any definite particularized goal, that the Intermediary Power finds its expression. Because the end is a finite one it necessarily manifests the Primary Power but only partially. When the will-to-do, the will-to-know and the will-to-enjoy are directed towards something finite, the whole which is infinite, remains concealed from our view. The nature of the Primary Power of consciousness is to embrace the infinite. It may be asked how this is known to be so. We know it by studying our consciousness deeply. In the pursuit of knowledge we seek to grasp infinite reason, in our emotional activity we strive to realize fullest joy, in our will-to-live we wish to secure fullness of existence. We have a glimpse of the infinite through these functions. The Primary Power of our consciousness, therefore, finds its manifestation only when we act for the infinite, know the infinite and enjoy the infinite, when we are "drawn toward the unbounded." To take all these functions back to the plane of infinity is to Śrī Jīva, the same as loving the whole, loving the infinite, which is again identical with loving God. Hence, the unity of consciousness finds its genuine manifestation in the love of "All," that is, in the love of God. The essence of consciousness therefore is "Love." Consciousness is what it is because it is Love.

(In the Sanskrit language there is more than one word for "love." Of these, two words, "Kāma" and "Preman" are somewhat like the Greek words Eros and Agapi. When the attachment is for something finite, it is called "kāma" in Sanskrit. When it for the infinite, for

God, it is called "Preman." Since this distinction is extremely important in the philosophy of Śrī Jīva, and since there is no way to express this diffrnce of meaning in the English language by one word, we capitalize the word "Love" to indicate that it is a translation of Preman; for Kāma we use "love" with a small letter.)

This Love is defined as "the unbroken feeling of the Universal Self in one's own self." It is described as "consciousness of consciousness, feeling of feeling and volition of volition." It is the state "anterior to the division between intellect, feeling, and will" where consciousness forms a unity which cannot be analyzed. Herein Śrī Jīva finds the positive factor which is intrinsic to consciousness and makes it what it is. That consciousness cannot be denied is due to the fact that it has this Primary Power, which makes it a unity. Denial means exclusion from knowledge. Since knowledge is an effect of the Intermediary Power of consciousness it can never exclude the Primary unity from its jurisdiction. Knowledge can exclude all that is dependent on it. It can even exclude itself. But it can never deny that in which it has its being. Knowledge cannot deny the unity of all knowledge, which constitutes the Primary Power of consciousness, since knowledge itself disappears if there is no unity at the base of it. Even the first principles of knowledge such as the law of identity or contradiction can be denied but not the unity of consciousness, since those laws are true and have sense only so far as consciousness is a unity. Pure knowledge without any objectivity may be possible but a state of knowledge without any unity is an impossibility. So undeniability of consciousness is due to this unity or Primary Power. All that is revealed within consciousness is real because of the Intermediary Power and all that is revealed by consciousness is real due to the secondary Power of consciousness.

Śrī Jīva has unearthed the three Powers of consciousness and has also discovered that the essential nature of consciousness is Love. He has now to apply these principles to the Universe at large. In other words, we are now ready to view the universe with the concept of Power applied to it.

The above analysis of the Powers of consciousness, however, are not so clearly stated anywhere in the writing of Śrī Jīva. But they seem to be the presuppositions and inner arguments of his mind. In the light of innumerable suggestions scattered throughout his works, I have ventured to explore the depth of his mind, as far as possible, in order to grasp him fully. The approach of Śrī Jīva towards the fundamental problem of the universe may be called "psychological." No doubt we of today shall criticize it as anthropomorphic. But to Śrī Jīva legitimate anthropomorphism seems not only justifiable but almost an indispensable element in method. He thinks that one is a part of nature and one's experience of self, in virtue of its very immediacy, is a privileged case. He does not find any reason why one should not interpret what one knows only from without in function of the reality that one knows from within. Rather, this seems to him to be the only procedure. It is said that just as a seed has the whole tree in potency dwelling within it, man has the

whole universe within himself; and if we dive deep into ourselves and explore our own consciousness we can find out the mysteries of the universe. Be that as it may, we must now turn our attention to reality itself and view it with Śrī Jīva.

III. REALITY

Consciousness is the fundamental reality and that because it is a unity, a fact which also indicates that its essential nature is Love. The entire universe to Śrī Jīva is Love and the expression of Love. The Parent Cause of the Universe is made up of concentrated Love. The center of Reality is the Supreme Consciousness. It has three Powers, the Primary, the Intermediary, and the Secondary. Primary Power makes the central reality just what it is in itself, namely the unity and embodiment of Love. The will-to-be, the will-to-know, and the will-to-enjoy are realized in Him in their fullest sense. He is All-existence, All-knowledge and All-joy. He is called *Sat*—the principle of Eternal life, the *Chit*—the principle of Real Knowledge and *Ānanda*—the principle of True Bliss. This Being is the God-head (*Parameśvara*), who is the unity of all three (*Sat-chit-ānanda*) and this unity is due to His Primary Power. This is the sustaining power and the only source of all.

His Intermediary Power which depends on the Primary Power and is an emanation from it, constitutes the self-conscious individual souls of the universe. These individual souls are called *jīva* or spiritual monads. The number of the monads are said to be infinite and innumerable. Every one of them is atomic and has emanated from the super conscious source, the Primary Power, even as a ray from the Sun. They are sometimes called "intelligent power" or "Radiating Power." A monad is a small individual unit that embodies the essential world-power for realization through itself. It is an integral center of life, knowledge and joy. A monad is a God in miniature. But unlike God, it has two faces, one towards the Primary and the other towards the Secondary Power. This is precisely why it is called Intermediary. Due to this double facedness, it always feels a tension between lower and higher.

The Secondary Power of God which depends on His Primary Power for its initial start but then functions independently, constitutes the psycho-physical reality called "Nature" (Prakṛti). (I capitalize Nature when I use it for the Sanskrit term Prakṛti). Nature is two fold, mental and physical. Nature depends directly on the monads and indirectly or remotely on God who is a sort of spectator in relation to the transaction between the Intermediary and Secondary Power. In a sense Nature is self-sufficient for all its functioning. In spite of the fact that Nature is a power of consciousness and emanation from the Supreme Source it is called non-intelligent (a-chit) or even unconscious (jaḍā), due to its relative independence of the other two more intimate powers of consciousness. Its functions are not due to any conscious deliberation, but due to a sort of habit, which it has acquired throughout the beginningless ages. Its procession is beginningless in the sense that it

is cyclic. The habitual power that makes it go is also called creative power (Karma Śakti). Since it creates itself as it proceeds analogous to our habitual activities, it appears to be working intelligently though not truly so. It owes its original impetus to intelligent direction. Such is Nature—the Secondary Power of the Lord. This is the outline of the world-view of Śrī Jīva. In the next two chapters we elaborate the metaphysics and theology of Śrī Jīva. In these two fields the contribution of Śrī Jīva is unique and original.

CHAPTER II

METAPHYSICS

The Absolute, writes Śrī Jīva, is the supreme truth, supreme value and supreme existence (*Tattva*). It is non-dual (*a-dvaya*) supra-consciousness (*Jñāna-tattva*). In order to clarify precisely what is meant by "consciousness," Śrī Jīva brings an argument against his own views. How, he asks, can consciousness be absolute: All the instances of consciousness are momentary happenings. Now one is conscious of a patch of blue, then one is conscious of a patch of yellow. What is it then that is meant by saying that consciousness is absolute and non-dual?

He then answers his own question. It is not the momentary instances of knowledge that is meant by consciousness. Consciousness (*chaitanya*) is a substance. It is pure sentiency (*upalabdhi-mātram*). It is that which the Upanisads speak of as the primal source from which all things come. It has its root and ground of existence in itself. It is truth and infinity (*satyam* and *anantam*). It being known, everything else is known. It is the ultimate essence of everything, the First Cause. It is that of which all individual monads are partial manifestations.

Śrī Jīva makes a clear distinction between consciousness which is *"kāraka sādhana"* and that which is *"Bhāva-sādhana."* The former means that which is the result of a process of transactions between subject and object, which constitutes the temporary instances of awareness. The latter *"Bhāva-sādhana"* is the consciousness which is the essence of being, which is always existent (*sarvadā-anuvartamānam*) as an accomplished fact and not the outcome of any accidental configuration. The second kind always underlies the first kind and makes the temporal instances of knowledge possible. The knowledge of a patch of yellow comes and goes, the awareness of a patch of blue appears and disappears, but pure consciousness never fails. It is due to this never failing substance that all these momentary phenomena are known to be so. Pure consciousness shines by its own light like the sun. This is self-shining, self-sufficient, absolute existence.

The Absolute is non-dual. Instead of saying it is one, the Vedāntist says it is non-dual, in order to indicate specifically that it has no second. By secondness is meant otherness. Want of otherness means want of distinction. Distinction (*bheda*) is understood in three different ways. (1) Distinction within the same type (*sajātīya* or *tādṛsa*) (2) Distinction that subsists between two dissimilar types of things. (*vijātīya* or *a-tādṛsa*) (3) Internal distinction (*svagata*). The dis-

tinction, for example, between an oak tree and a pine tree illustrates the first kind. The distinction between an oak tree and a cow, for instance, exemplifies the second kind. The internal differentiation between the branches, leaves and the trunk of an oak tree is a specimen of the third kind of otherness.

The Absolute is one without a second, says Śrī Jīva, and he substantiates his statement by the Upaniṣad (*ekamevādvitīyam*). It has no 'other' of any kind—neither of different kind, nor of similar kind, nor even within itself. In this respect Śrī Jīva is in perfect agreement with Śaṅkara, since Śaṅkara also maintains that the absolute is pure homogeneous consciousness without any self-differentiation. There is nothing other than Brahman, either of the same kind or of different kind. It is Rāmānuja who holds that the Absolute has self-differentiation.

So far as the first two kinds of distinctions (*bheda*) are concerned, Śrī Jīva, Rāmānuja, Śaṅkara—as a matter of fact all Vedāntists—are in perfect agreement. This agreement means that they all believe that there is one and only one primal existence and that is consciousness (*chaitanya*). In this sense they are all monists. But the differences of opinion arise when the third kind of distinction is in question: i. e., whether or not the absolute has any internal differentiation. Rāmānuja answers this question in the affirmative, Śaṅkara in the negative. Śrī Jīva sides with Śaṅkara. For Rāmānuja, the self-differentiation of the absolute consists in the two modes: intelligent individual monads and non-intelligent nature. But for Śaṅkara, these two so-called modes of Rāmānuja are mere false readings of the one underlying absolute consciousness. Now, Śrī Jiva, accepting, as he does with Śaṅkara the view that the absolute has no internal differentiation, is not at all ready to relegate all individual monads and the world-order to the realm of illusion. There he sides with Rāmānuja and says that they are also as much real as the absolute. Śrī Jiva thus accepts all the positive contributions of his two predecessors. But how he can do it consistently is the question. If the absolute is non-dual in the strict sense of the term, then Śaṅkara is right and then the objective world with all its individualities must be the false appearance of that One Reality. But if the objective world with all its manifold particularities is real then Rāmānuja is right and then the Absolute reality is not non-dual in the strictest sense, since it has self-differentiations. Śrī Jīva seems to uphold two apparently inconsistent doctrines: that the world-order with all its manifoldness is real, and at the same time, that the Absolute Reality is non-dual in the strictest sense. Śrī Jiva believes that he is consistent, due to what he calls the "Power" of consciousness. He denies that the Absolute has any self-differentiation but upholds very strongly the view that it has Primary Power (*Svarupā Śakti*). The Śaṅkarites urge against him that if the Absolute has power then it has self-differentiation. But Śrī Jiva answers that this does not necessarily follow. Now, what this mysterious agency called Power (*Śakti*) is, we shall let Śrī Jīva himself bring out with as much clarity as he commands.

Śrī Jīva takes upon himself the charge of proving two propositions. (1) That Absolute Consciousnecc *has* "Power." (2) That the Absolute is strictly non-dual in spite of the fact that it has "Power." The merit and success of the philosophy of Śrī Jīva depend on establishing these two theses.

In order to prove that absolute reality has "Power," Śrī Jīva appeals first to common sense and then to the law of causality.

It does not require a philosopher, he says, to decide this question. Anybody, not merely a philosopher, would vouch for it that a thing can not exist unless there is some power in it. If the ultimate reality exists, it must have power.

Then Śrī Jīva makes the other appeal, that to the law of causality. A thing, he says, is said to exist when it *does* something. Doing something means to be the cause of it. Nothing in the world can become a cause unless it has some power. Nowhere in the world can one exhibit a cause without any power whatsoever. That absolute consciousness is the first cause of the universe is a truth accepted by all Vedāntists. It must therefore have power.

Śrī Jīva then refutes his own arguments by taking the position of his opponent. The appeal to common sense, he says, is of no value, because common sense knowledge is considered to be false knowledge of the ultimate truth. So a majority vote cannot prove any truth of metaphysics. Neither is the second argument of any weight. Certainly Absolute consciousness would have power if it were the cause of the universe in the ordinary sense of the term cause. We say clay is the cause of the pot, that is to say, clay is the material out of which it is made. Or we say that the potter is the cause of the pot, meaning that he is the operating cause. The clay or the potter would not be the cause of the pot unless they had power to perform what they do. But Absolute consciousness is the cause of the universe in neither of those senses. It is cause, to be sure, but in a very different sense. The Absolute is the underlying substratum. It is neither the efficient nor the material cause. The effect is not any transformation or modification of the cause but simply an illusory appearance of it. The Absolute is said to be the cause only in the sense that it has to *be present* in order that appearance may at all be possible; much as a piece of rope may be said to be the cause of an illusory snake or mother-of-pearl of illusory silver. The rope or the mother-of-pearl does not cause the snake or silver in the usual sense of the term causing. It forms the substratum which must be present in order that an illusory experience could be possible. Hence, the proof that the Absolute has power since it is a cause, does not hold water.

These are the arguments Śrī Jīva brings against himself from the standpoint of his opponent. He then in turn answers them.

If the appeal to the common sense of mankind is not adequate let us turn to the wise men, the liberated souls. Let us consider the state of liberation itself. What is liberation? It is conceived by all Vedāntists to be a state of infinite joy and bliss. This joy is said to be due to the fact that one realizes or becomes identical with what one really is.

The inner essence of a person and that of the universe is the same and the actualization of that essence brings infinite joy. Joy has no meaning without manifestation or efflux. Infinite joy can only be due to the incessant overflow of the inner essence. The flow or manifestation of joy would not be possible if the ultimate essence had no power. If liberation is not mere nothingness or darkness or extinction of everything, but the overflow of bliss and peace, then the ultimate essence must possess power. If liberation were nothingness no one would pursue it. But as a matter of fact, everybody seeks liberation knowingly or unknowingly, as genuinely as they seek after enjoyment, since liberation is nothing but the consummation of the will-to-enjoy in its purest and fullest sense.

This argument is again refuted from the standpoint of the opponent by saying that the joy of self manifestation of the liberated state would be possible by the self-illuminating nature of the ultimate substance itself and there is no need of assuming an extra entity called "Power" for that purpose.

This contention is again answered. Self-illumination or self-expressiveness connotes two things. Negatively, it means that it does not depend on anything else to illumine itself. Positively, it means expressiveness. It is precisely this expressiveness of the absolute which we call "Power."

Let us then look at the other argument, the one based on causality. The ultimate essence is not a cause in the ordinary sense and hence it can not have power on that account; such is the contention of the opponent. Śrī Jīva attacks this position of his opponent in two ways; firstly, by accepting the thesis of the opponent and secondly, by showing the defect of the opponent's position.

(1) Let us grant that ultimate reality is not the cause in the ordinary sense. That is to say, it is neither an efficient cause such as a potter nor a material cause such as clay. But still we can not do away with power. You say that the Absolute is the cause of the world just as a piece of rope is the cause of an illusory snake. That is to say that it has no causal efficacy. It does not impart anything whatsoever to the effect, but simply underlies it. Now the question is what is this *underlying?* If the underlying substratum has no power at all why may not the illusory principle (māyā) itself create the world? If the underlying essence does not help the situation a bit, why not then eliminate it altogether? The very fact that you are not ready to throw it out indicates that it has some power, whether you recognize it or not. Morever, you cannot hold that there is no relationship whatsoever between the illusory object and the substratum that underlies it. Since we find that in order that there may be the possibility of an illusion of a snake, there must be a rope or something of that sort and not a mother-of-pearl; whereas in order that there could be a possible illusion of silver, it is a piece of mother-of-pearl that has to be there and not a piece of charcoal. In order that there should be such false knowledge as this phenomenal universe is, there must be precisely absolute consciousness as its underlying substratum. This is your contention and this itself

proves that the absolute substratum has some power and relationship with the phenomena whether admitted or not.

(2) Śrī Jīva then in turn shows the inadequacy and utter illogicality of the theory of illusion or false knowledge.

In order that there can be any knowledge whatever, there must be a subject and an object of that knowledge. Since false knowledge is a kind of knowledge it must have a subject and an object. Now show us, urges Śrī Jīva, which is the subject and which is the object of this so-called false knowledge? According to your thesis there is but one substance in the universe which you call noumenal reality (*kutastha nitya*) and there is the phenomenal reality which is for you simply a mis-reading or false interpretation of the noumenal. Now let us test all the possibilities.

(a) This false knowledge has no subject, since neither the noumenal consciousness nor the phenomenal can be its subject. The noumenon can not be the subject since it is this noumenon which is misread or falsely known. It is therefore the object of false reading. Furthermore, the noumenal consciousness can not be the subject of the false knowledge because it is purely luminous truth itself and nothing false or erroneous can ever inhere in truth. Nothing in the phenomenal universe can be the subject of that false knowledge, because phenomena are the result of that false knowledge. In other words, false knowledge is presupposed in the very possibility of phenomena, and hence nothing in phenomena can be the subject of that false knowledge.

(b) This so-called false knowledge has no object. For, neither the noumenon nor the phenomenon can be its object. The noumenal consciousness can not be the object because all objectivity is said to be phenomenal and therefore unreal. Anything that can be the object can not be ultimately real according to your thesis. Hence the ultimate consciousness is held to be pure subjectivity, and cannot therefore be the object of false knowledge. Neither can anything in the phenomena be the object of that false knowledge, because the phenomena are the result of false knowledge and therefore presuppose false knowledge for their very possibility.

Your so-called false knowledge is therefore a kind of knowledge which has neither subject nor object. Knowledge, false or real, if it is without any knower and known, must be considered a meaningless fiction. The so-called false knowledge is therefore itself a false knowledge. It is a worse delusion than the delusion of *māyā*. The only way that this illusion theory of yours can have any sense is to hold that false knowledge or ignorance is something self-existent; that it can exist without any subject or object. If this is admitted then there arises another serious difficulty of asserting two self-existent entities, one, absolute consciousness and the other, ignorance. This means to give up the philosophy of non-duality. The theory that it (the empirical universe) is born of the illusion of our ignorance is absurd in that it involves accepting that "ignorance" to be something self-existent, having an independent existence separate from the all-in-all, the One-without-a-second (*advitīyam*).

It is held by the opponent that in the state of liberation all false knowledge disappears and true knowledge flashes in. The content of this true knowledge is said to be something like this: no other thing except absolute universal consciousness is the ultimately real substance. Now, who is the knower of this true knowledge? asks Śrī Jīva. It (the knower) can not be anything phenomenal, since all that is phenomenal is, according to the hypothesis, the object of exclusion from the realm of true knowledge. Only one possibility is left. Absolute consciousness itself is the knower of this true knowledge. We then ask whether this fact is true or false. If it is false, then it should again be sublated by another true knowledge and thus you are committed to a *regressus ad infinitum*. If then this fact (absolute knowing itself) be true then it is admitted that Absolute Consciousness is the Knower of Truth. To be the Knower is to have the Power of Knowing. And if to be the Knower be its essential nature, then this Power, we should say, is the Innermost or eternal Power which we are advocating. The celebrated theory of illusion (māyā) therefore does not, to use a phrase of Rāmānuja, 'stand the grinding in the mill of dialectic.'

Thus establishing to his satisfaction that the Absolute must have "Power," Śrī Jīva sets himself to the task of proving that due to this fact ultimate substance does not give up its character of being non-dual. It is still One-without-a-Second in the strictest possible sense of the term.

First of all he argues against himself from the standpoint of his opponent.

What is this mysterious Power? Is it different from the Absolute or non-different? If the former is accepted, then the ultimate real becomes dual, which is against your basic position. If the latter alternative is accepted, then we ask, why call it by another name Power? It is the same as the Absolute substance itself.

Before we follow Śrī Jīva's answer to this argument, let us try to understand clearly, just precisely what it is that he is attempting to tell us by his conception of this Eternal Power (*Svarupā Śakti*) of *Brahman* (Absolute).

The conception that Śrī Jīva has in his mind is a unique one. We have seen that ultimate substance, according to Śaṅkara, is a perfectly static substance and this is the reason why all the variations, modifications, transformations, attributes and the like are regarded by Śaṅkara as things foreign or alien to ultimate reality. Hence they are all labeled false or illusory. Anything that is alien to truth has to be false. Rāmānuja, on the other hand, denies the static conception of reality. He upholds the position that the ultimate reality is a dynamic being and hence all modifications, transformations, attributes, relations are real for him. What is unreal or fiction for Rāmānuja is the static conception of reality. Now what Śrī Jīva is laboring to bring forth by his conception of eternal Power is that Absolute reality is both static and dynamic. He thinks that these two ideas are not contradictory. Does he then hold, like Bradley, that in reality all contradictions are 'somewhat transmuted'? No, Śrī Jīva does not believe that they *are* contradictory in appearance and then somehow 'transmuted' in reality.

He, on the other hand, affirms that the two conceptions, static and dynamic, are not contradictory at all. This he holds, because by static and dynamic he means something very definite. The Absolute is static to Śrī Jīva in so far as it is an undivided integrity—a unity. And the same reality is dynamic in so far as expressiveness is its essential nature. The eternal or Primary Power of the absolute is that which makes these two facts possible.

To Śaṅkara, unchangeableness is a corollary of infinitude, and motion indicates lack of something and hence imperfection. Movement to Śaṅkara, as to Aristotle, reveals lack of actuality, lack of completeness and therefore it is only the finite that can move. The Absolute of Śaṅkara, therefore, is unmoved, and static. It is not even the 'mover.' For, as Śaṅkara sees it, it can not be the 'mover' unless it ceases to be unmoved.

To Rāmānuja, however, dynamism means liveliness and concreteness. Immobility, to him, indicates deadness and uselessness. Now, to Śrī Jīva, unchangeability means exactly what it means to Śaṅkara, but being dynamic does not necessarily mean to him lack of perfection. For to him, the absolute is "Love" and dynamism of the Absolute, therefore, far from being contradictory to unchangeability, is rather necessary to its perfection because it is perfect in Love. When something is truly static in the sense of Śrī Jīva it can not help being dynamic. These two natures of the absolute therefore are not two different aspects of it, looked at from two different angles, rather, they are true at one and the same time, one being the necessary outcome of the fullness of the other. This *Svarupā Śakti* (Primary Power) merely indicates this statico-dynamic nature of Bhagavān (God-head) and differentiates it from the static character of the absolute. It is this that Śrī Jīva seeks to express by saying that the absolute substance has eternal Primary Power and that this "Power" is the same as Love.

Since dynamism is the necessary outcome of the static absolute in this sense, Śrī Jīva can not see why his admission of 'Power' should involve any dual element in the Absolute. So says the Seer of the Iśā Upaniṣad. "It moves, it moves not." This is the reason why Śrī Jīva agrees with Śaṅkara in admitting that the Absolute is non-dual in all possible senses and yet he holds that it has 'Power,' it is static and dynamic at the same time.

This eternal "Power" of the Absolute is a unity. Now of what is it a unity? It is the unity of will-to-be (*sandhinī*), will-to-know (*saṁvit*), and will-to-enjoy (*hlādinī*), in their fullest consummation. That means that the Absolute is all-joy, all-knowledge and all-existence. Reality is not the sum of these things, neither is it a unity in the sence of Bradley "in which all things coming together are transmuted, in which they are changed all alike though not changed equally." These three: all-joy, all-knowledge and all-existence are one and identical in the absolute reality and it is the indivisible integration of them that constitutes the eternal Primary Power of the Absolute. It is due to this fact that the Absolute is perfect, unchangeable and static. What then again makes it dynamic? The fullness of existence means that He exists

completely and makes other things exist in and through His existence. Completion of all knowledge means that He knows and makes others know in and through His infinite knowledge. All-joy means that He feels the joy of a full life and knowledge and makes others do the same in and through the fullness of His eternal bliss. The existence that is in Him is not abstract existence but it expresses itself concretely and fully. His consciousness or reason is not a mere ideal but stands for a knowledge of reality. The joy that is in Him is not self-contained contentment where there is nothing to contribute to joy, but joy in positively joyous conditions of life. It is this incessant urge for expressiveness that makes the absolute dynamic. There is a need for an "other" in the Absolute itself and that accounts for all creativity. But this "other" can not make the Absolute dual in any sense, since this need is not a need of imperfection or anything extraneous. It is the necessity of the fact of fullness of manifestation of all-joy, all-knowledge and all-existence in Him. It is this statico-dynamic indivisible integration which constitutes the eternal Primary Power of the Absolute Love which is also non-dual in the strictest sense of the term. This is the contention of Śrī Jiva.

Now let us turn to the question that was raised, whether or not this Power makes the Absolute non-dual. We have seen the argument of the opponent that if this Power is different from the Absolute, it ceases to be non-dual, since it involves self-differentiation. If on the other hand, this Power is not different from the Absolute then there is no need of calling it by a new name such as "Power." Śrī Jiva, however, does not use many words in order to refute the argument which he himself had raised from the standpoint of his opponent. He replies to it as one does to a dilemma. He says: because of the fact that it is quite impossible to conceive of this "Power" as identical with Absolute Being we call it "different" (*bheda*) and again because it is just as difficult to conceive of this "Power" as distinguished from the ultimate Being we call it "identical" (*abheda*). This identity and difference between the "Power" and the Powerful is the essential truth, but it is beyond our human comprehension and logical conceptualization. These are Śrī Jiva's own words. With this he closes, announcing that he does not particularly like to be designated as a non-dualist (*advaitist*), but the upholder of "the inconceivable relation of difference and identitiy" (*achintya vedā-veda*). It is due to this particular statement that his philosophy goes by the name "Achintya vedāveda-vāda."

CHAPTER III

THEOLOGY

I. GOD

From what has already been said it is evident that the philosophy of Śrī Jiva is theocentric like that of Spinoza or of Thomas Aquinas. Theology is the substantial part of philosophy. It is the crown of philosophy. Or, perhaps it would be more correct to say that Śrī Jiva has

no idea that theology and philosophy could be two separate domains of thought. Although it is true for all Vedāntists that theology and philosophy are the part and parcel of the one and the same discipline, still in Śaṅkara one can recognize some distinction between them. For Śaṅkara there is only one truth and that is the Absolute. You may call it God if you wish, but to Śaṅkara it is neither creator, nor preserver, nor saviour, nor providence. For all these expressions presuppose relation and the Absolute is beyond all relations. The realm of relation is the realm of phenomena for Śaṅkara and hence theology belongs to the phenomenal world. Within the phenomena Śaṅkara recognizes degrees of reality and there God (Īsvara) stands the highest. But God is not the Absolute. He is less than the Absolute. He is one step lower. When the Absolute limits itself, it becomes God.

Different, however, is the view of Rāmānuja and very different is that of Śrī Jīva. For Rāmānuja, the Absolute itself is a personality. He is a determinate Being of infinite attributes. He is the material cause, the efficient cause and the *Causa sui* (Svayambhu). He is the Providence and the Lord. Hence for Rāmānuja theology and philosophy are identical. Śaṅkara places God below the Absolute and prefers to call Him the lower Brahman. Rāmānuja makes them identical and puts them on the same throne. But Śrī Jīva's God has quite a different position. Śrī Jīva places God above and beyond the Absolute. This perhaps appears illogical. How can there be anything beyond the Absolute? The expression itself does not mean anything to us. But we shall see that this signifies something very meaningful to Śrī Jīva and that again it is in perfect consistency with the spirit of his system.

We have seen that the ultimate substance for Śrī Jīva is the Absolute Consciousness. It is a unity of the three principles; will-to-be, will-to-know and will-to-enjoy in their fullness. This means that the Absolute Being is all-existence, all-knowledge and all-joy. Śrī Jīva can express it in one word. The Absolute Reality is Love. It is this nature of the Absolute that accounts for its unceasing expressiveness. The nature of perfect Love is to overflow. So far as the Absolute is a perfect Being, it is steady, calm, and immutable, but so far as the outburst of Love is concerned, it is a mobile, flexible and dynamic substance. Due to perfect integrity the Absolute is a Being and due to indomitable impetus for expressiveness, it is a Becoming. Since it is a Becoming it has a "life" and a "history." The creation is an expression of supreme delight of the Love Absolute. The Absolute becomes creator not because of any limitation, as Śaṅkara would have us believe; but because of the exuberance of fullness the permanent being becomes fluent. As a poet composes his poems not to limit himself but to give expression to his inner joy so does the creator create out of the fullness of his Being. The Absolute then has a history. But this is not all. Śrī Jīva tells us that the Absolute not only has a life-history but it has two lives and two life-histories! Before we try to understand just what is meant by holding that one and the same reality can have two lives we should discuss the Trinity or the three stadia in the life of the Absolute Being.

The Absolute Being is all-existence, all-knowledge and all-joy. Though these three phases are indivisible, still, due to the eternal will-to-manifest, three moments are distinguishable in the life of the Absolute Being. (i) All-existence, (ii) all-existence and all-consciousness, (iii) all existence, all consciousness and all-joy. In fact, every phase involves the other, nevertheless a difference in degree is recognized due to the following considerations.

There can be existence without knowledge and joy. That is to say, such existence is logically possible. In order to exist, a thing need not be conscious of itself and be joyous. But this is not so when consciousness is in question. An entity in order to be conscious must exist. Existence can not be potential in consciousness. If consciousness is actual then it must be actually existent. There can be an unconscious existent, but not a non-existent consciousness. But again a conscious existence need not necessarily be joyful. Joy may be in it potentially but it need not be actual. But the situation is altogether different when joy itself is in question. In order to be joyous, an entity must exist and must be conscious of its existence. There may be a joyless consciousness but never an unconscious joy. So if joy be actual then consciousness and existence must be actual. Thus it is obvious that there is a difference in degree of depth and fullness in these three moments of the life of the Absolute.

One moment is the pure existence, the root and sustainer of all existence. This is called *Paramatma* who is the ground of all existence. The next higher moment is all-consciousness which involves all-existence. It is an existence conscious of itself. This stadium is called *Brahman* or the Absolute par excellence. Throughout the Vedāntic Ontology it has been held that the Absolute is pure consciousness which is existent. But now according to our present analysis we find that there is another moment beyond the Absolute par excellence. This is all-joy. This stadium comprehends the Absolute but still goes beyond it. This is called *Bhagavān-Kriṣṇa*. As nearly as possible we may translate Paramātmā as World-Spirit and Brahman as the Absolute and Bhagavān-Kriṣṇa as the Supreme God-head. Dr. Seal observes that Brahman corresponds to Hegel's Absolute Idea, Paramātmā to its heterization in Nature and Spirit and Bhagavān (God-head) to the complete cycle of the dialectic process. But it is important to notice that the Vaiṣṇava philosophers more clearly than Hegel begin with Bhagavān, the eternally perfected Absolute Person and also end in Him. Śrī Jīva starts with the Supreme God-head and then derives the other two from Him and then again shows the consummation of all in Him. He is the eternally perfect and Absolute Person, infinite in excellence, power and sweetness.

The Paramātmā (World-Spirit, who is both immanent and transcendent) satisfies Rāmānuja; the Brahman (Absolute par excellence of pure consciousness), satisfies the demand of Śaṅkara; and Śrī Jīva has his Bhagavān (the Supreme God-head) beyond them all. It should be noted that this was not made to satisfy any one's demand. It

is the necessary outcome of the systematic thinking of the philosopher. The Paramātmā (World-Spirit) may be called the descending Absolute who accounts for the cosmic order and Bhagavān (the transcending supreme Person) may be called the ascending Absolute, who accounts for a supra-cosmic sphere. Thus we come to understand what is meant by the statement that the Absolute Being has two life histories. The supra-cosmic life of the God-head is called *Nitya Līlā* or Eternal Play and His cosmic life is called *Sristi-Līlā,* or Creative play. As regards to the latter Śrī Jīva is in perfect agreement with Rāmānuja, with the only difference that Nature (Prakṛti) which, to Rāmānuja, is a "mode" of the Absolute Being, is, to Śrī Jīva, the Secondary Power of God. As regards to the former, the supra cosmic realm of existence, we consider next some of the unique conceptions of Śrī Jīva.

III. LILA OR THE DIVINE SPORT

What has been called life-histories of the Absolute is termed "Līlā" meaning Play or Sport of the Deity. The Lord plays, it is said, due to "exuberance of spirit." The Sport of the Lord is natural to Him because "He is full of self-bliss." The Neo-Vaiṣṇavas often draw the analogy with the play of children. The playing of children is said to be the expression of fullness. Not due to any want or definite purpose but out of exuberance of energy does a child play. A child is considered to be a type of full personality, because the individuality of the child has not yet been fragmented like that of an adult by a number of chaotic desires and uncontrolled passions. The state of a completely integral personality, therefore, has in some sense great similarity with that of a child. This is the reason the sport of the Lord is not only compared with, but also expressed as, "child's sport." It is almost invariably described by such terms as singing, dancing or playing on the eternal flute. These are considered to be the expressions of the exuberance of joy. Indeed, "the voice that is just enough can speak and cry to the extent needed for every day use, but that which is abundant sings and in it we find our joy."

The Absolute, we observed, has two lives or sportive actions. One of them is associated with the World-Spirit (Paramātmā) who is descending and the result of whose activity is the cosmos. The other is connected with the supreme God-head (Bhagavān) who is ascending and whose expression is called "Goloka" the supra mundane plane of eternal delight. The difference between these two realms of divine sport is variously expressed and explained. One of the most important points of difference lies in the fact that the lower order is cyclic and the higher order is rectilinear, that is to say, the former has evolution and involution where as the latter moves on and on ever increasing throughout eternity. This difference between the two spheres is due to the fact that the higher order is the expression of the Primary Power of God and the lower order is that of His Intermediary and Secondary Power. Now, it is believed that the potentialities of the Intermediary and Secondary Power reside in the World-Spirit (Paramātmā) as seeds.

In creation they unfold and become actual. It is considered a fundamental principle in nature that when something becomes actual from its seed-like potentiality, it has always a tendency to back to that potential state again. The analogy is taken from the tree and seed and their seasonal germination. This principle explains the evolution and involution in the cyclic movement of the cosmic order.

Now, the God-head in His Primary Power is a perfectly actualized Person. All-existence, all-knowledge and all-joy reside in Him in their fullest actuality. The expression of this Primary Power cannot be one of potentiality. It is a manifestation without any potentiality, and it goes on increasing uninterruptedly for eternity. Kṛiṣṇadas Kavirāja says that the embodiment of Infinite Love is full in the fullest sense and has no more room to grow but behold the mystery is still increasing every moment throughout the never-ending time. In this process of never-ending augmentation all the values of joyful delight that are realized remain conserved with Him for all time. It grows and grows and never ceases. Śrī Jīva shows that even the derivative meaning of the word "Brahman" supports his view, since "Brahman" means one who grows and makes everything else grow.

It is also important to notice that both cosmic and supra cosmic orders are considered to be beginningless and endless. Only one of them moves like a wheel in time and is subject to time, while the other moves like an arrow or snowball and transcends time in the sense that every moment of it is full and pregnant with the entire past. This movement of the latter has a dialectical nature which we shall discuss presently.

IV. THE PERSONALITY OF THE GOD-HEAD

The supreme God-head (Bhagavān) is a concrete Person (Puruṣa). He is called the *Uttama Puruṣa* or *Hari Puruṣa,* that is, the most exalted Person. We noted in the Trinity that Śrī Jīva conceives of the Absolute as both self-conscious and pure consciousness. The Three Beings that constitute the three moments in the life of the Absolute are all conscious principles. But Bhagavān, who is the highest of the three, is not only a self-conscious Being but He is said to be a concrete Person having a perfect Form also. The World-Spirit and the Absolute par excellence (Paramātmā and Brahman) are formless but the Supreme God-head has a "beautiful Form." By form is meant "Body." The highest Lord has a "Body" and His Body is like that of a man, or more correctly, the human being looks like Him rather than He like us. The human body is said to be a very imperfect copy of the most perfect "Body" of the Lord. The beauty and sweetness of the Body of the Lord surpass all description and intellectual comprehension. But having a body does not make Him anytheless Absolute, at least to Śrī Jīva and his followers. Unlimitedness and limitation, Śrī Jīva tells us, are not contradictory. They together represent the fullest import of the Joy Absolute. The "Body" of the Lord is made of pure consciousness (chit). As water becomes ice due to excessive cold so does the Absolute consciousness assume a Form due to the exuberance of joy and delight. It is not a

material cast but a self-effulgent spiritual figure. Its component stuff is "rasa" which is said to be the quintessence of blissful consciousness. The blissful Body of the Lord is nothing but joy condensed. This conception of the God-head having a body like a human body will not appear grotesque if we remember what has been said in the first book of the Bible regarding the genesis of man.

V. THE ATTRIBUTES OF THE GOD-HEAD

Infinite auspicious qualities are attributed to the Lord. It is however always insisted on that all attributes are identical with His essence and not accidental. Another very interesting and important point is made about the Lord's attributes. All the auspicious qualities are divided into two classes, one class is called *"aisvarya"*—majestic—and the other class is called *"mādhurya"* meaning charming. To the highest God-head, the First Person of the Trinity the former class of attributes is denied and simply the latter class is ascribed. In order to understand the reason of this we need to enter into the very heart of the theology of Śrī Jīva. The simple literal meaning of the two terms *'aisvarya'* and *'madhuryā'* as majestic and charming respectively do not help us much unless we realize just what is meant and why.

All the divine qualities such as omniscience, omnipotence, omni-presence, etc., are included in the majestic category by virtue of the fact that they are too great for human beings to comprehend, and hence they make the God-head unapproachable. The attributes, on the other hand, which we may call supremely human such as friendliness, sympathy, kindliness, attractiveness, deep affection, eagerness to love and to be loved, etc., are included in the sweet-category. These are the qualities that we appreciate and praise every day, as we come in contact with our fellow men in society and particularly with our most dear ones in the family circle. We may call them ideal domestic virtues. These domestic virtues are charming and they are pre-eminently attributed to the highest Lord. If we can conceive—and perhaps this is not very difficult—one single person who is the best father to his children, the kindest master to his attendants, the sweetest child to his parents, the most amiable friend to his associates and the most loving husband to his wife, then, when this is conceived, we shall have some idea as to what kind of personality the supreme God-head is supposed to be like by Śrī Jīva and his school. The Lord is at one and the same time father, master, son, friend and husband in their most ideal sense. He is called *"madhura"* as He exhibits in Himself all ideal virtues. The term *"madhura"* literally means 'sweet,' but it is also a technical word. As we have entered into the subject we would better do justice to this technical phrase by bringing out its significance more fully.

As was just observed, the "majestic" quality, which seems to place God and man very far from each other, has not been attributed to the highest God-head. The question arises whether the Lord does at all possess those qualities or whether he altogether lacks them. It seems obvious to us that the Supreme Lord can not lack such qualities as omni-

presence. Could we say then that He possesses them but does not make use of them? This also seems illogical. If one is omniscient and knows everything, how can he possibly help using that power. Can he then forget about it? This appears to be impracticable. It seems utterly impossible for a person to have the power of omniscience and to be forgetful of having it at the same time. But this is precisely what Śrī Jīva asserts to be the situation regarding the God-head. The Lord creates, says Śrī Jīva, a new "Principle" which covers Himself. He does it in order that He may be more sweet and consequently more sociable and approachable to human beings. His love is incomplete until he can communicate. In order to make the communication possible He creates out of Himself a novel "Principle" which is called *"Yoga-māyā."* Creating this "Principle" out of Himself, the Lord has given it freedom so that "Yoga-māyā can lord it over Himself. The principle of "Yoga-māyā" therefore is the principle which conceals the so-called "majestic" or ultra-human qualities of the God-head and lets the supremely human qualities shine forth more charmingly and beautifully. What shines out in this way is considered to be more real and graceful than what is veiled. By virtue of this principle of "Yoga-māyā" the Lord does and does not possess omniscience, omnipotence, and the like at the same time. He behaves as if he is not omniscient. This behaviour of His is not pretense but is genuine, because the principle of "Yoga-māyā" has been given the power to function free of the Lord's will. To illustrate the point, supposing Śrī Jīva knew of Jesus Christ and saw Him suckling the breast of the Virgin Mary. Śrī Jīva would say that this is "sweet" or *"madhurā"* because the Son of God does not need a mother's breast to live on, but still as Christ He does it. This is due to "Yoga-māyā" that has made Him forget that He is the Son of God.

Now we are in a position to understand the technical phrase *"Madhura"* (sweet). "Sweetness" of the God-head consists in the exhibition of His most supremely human qualities when the ultra-human qualities of His are concealed by the function of "Yoga-māyā." The Yoga-māyā plays an important role in the "sweet" activities of the Lord in the eternal realm as well as in the cosmic realm when the Lord incarnates on earth.

VI. THE "SWEET" ACTIVITIES OF THE LORD: DIALECTIC OF LOVE

We are now in a position to realize the precise character of the Eternal sport of the supra-mundane domain. The Unity and simplicity of the Lord have been established. But the enjoyment of Love in the truest sense seems to require companions. In order to become Himself in the fullest sense the Lord has to create His associates. Unity even at the very root chooses to show itself in variety. This is the message of the philosophy of Śrī Jīva. The Lord and His Primary Power has been spoken of as non-different. Now it is said that He separates Himself from His Primary Power. In other words He divides Himself into two—the Being-for-self and the Being-for-expression. The former is He Himself and is called *Kriṣṇa,* one who draws, and the latter is His Primary Power called *Rādhā,* one who adores.

Radha means adoration or Love-devotion. Rādhā is the embodied manifestation of Kriṣṇa's Love-principle—the energy of His Soul, the principle in Kriṣṇa which sets His Love into motion.

They are identical in reality though a concrete realization of Love demands a seeming difference between them. The Being-for-Self (Kriṣṇa) is the charming embodiment and agent of the most supreme delight and the Being-for-expression (Rādhā) is the inner essence and creator of rhythm of that Love-life.

In order that the Lord may enjoy Himself, Rādhā assumes different stages of the love-relation and appears before Him variously. When the Primary Power (Rādhā) serves as a servant the Lord is Master. When this Power loves as friend the Lord is the Friend. When Rādhā caresses as mother, the Lord is the Child and lastly when Rādhā endears as wife the Lord is the Beloved. The Sweetness is said to increase from servantship through friendship and motherhood and culminates in wife-hood. The Being-for-expression (Rādhā) thus approaches closer and closer to the Being-for-self (Kriṣṇa) and ultimately they become unified again. By the power of "Yoga-māyā"—the Divine creativity—all these intermediate stages are conserved throughout eternity. All these constitute the eternal home of the Lord. This is the eternal ideal type of all homes in the world. In this eternal home there exist an eternal mother, an eternal friend, an eternal servant, and an eternal wife, all centered around the Lord who is the most ideal son, friend, master, and husband all at once. All the homes in the universe are imperfect imitations of that Perfect One. They all participate in it. Here is a specimen of the much enriched Platonism of the Orient. Plato's ideas had no flesh or blood, but these are all eternally living beings!

The Neo-Vaiṣṇava thinkers march on with this dialectical march of Love. They say that the loving sport of the Lord never stops. It moves on uninterruptedly in a dialectical fashion. When the Being-for-expression (Rādhā) becomes unified again with the Being-for-self (Kriṣṇa), the God-head becomes more enriched and more sweet. As a synthesis He comprehends within Himself all the stages of the love processes that have preceded. He is now called 'Gourānga'—the Brilliant One, or the Great Lord (*Mahā-Prabhu*). The Brilliant One again separates His Being-for-expression, the Eternal Bliss (*Nityānanda*), from Himself. In this second round of the dialectic a new note is struck. The "Eternal Bliss" (*Nityānanda*) not only appears as servant, parent, associates and family members before the Lord, but also "distributes himself" to all human beings so that they may also share, in and through him, in the love of the Lord and thereby heighten the enjoyment of the Lord. The "Eternal Bliss" (Nityānanda) gradually approaches the Lord as the phases of love deepen and ultimately becomes unified with Him in the most ecstatic state of joy, thus completing the second round of the dialectical movement of Love. The synthesis now reached is called *"Hari Purusa"*—the thrice Great and the Holiest Lord. He is the Best and the most supreme Personality. He is said to be infinitely Infinite in joy and Love (*Anantā-nanta-maya*). His Love now overflows not only to have joy in family groups or in friendly circles but

to make the entire universe participate in His joyous sport. He longs and longs for all the created monads which, including atoms and molecules (*aṇu-paramāṇu*) are innumerable in number. He feels, as it were, that he is incomplete without them. Hari Puruṣa is called the Giver of Universal Beatitude (Mahā-uddhārana). His unceasing longing results in the need for Incarnation. He incarnates or manifests Himself on earth in order to embrace his loving beings. This longing of the Lord to communicate Himself should be carefully distinguished from the first longing which is for creation. The first overflow of Love is to create and the second outburst is to incarnate and thereby to be reunited with the created. For joy is the creation, for more joy is the Incarnation.

To come back to the Love-dialectic. The dialectical movement of Love finds its culmination in the Hari Puruṣa, who is the highest synthesis of all the previous moments of overflowing joy. All the phases of Love that find expression in the process remain in their fullness in the consumatory stage, which is to say, that Hari Puruṣa comprehends in Himself all the sweetness and charm of Gourānga-Nityānanda and Rādhā-Kriṣṇa, i. e., the two stages of synthesis reached by Him in His eternal march of Love.

VII. SUPREME BEATITUDE

The Summum bonum or supreme beatitude of human life consists of participating in this eternal love-life of the God-head. This participation on the part of a monad (Intermediary Power) becomes possible when one transcends one's lower life-centre. The Intermediary Power, we observed before, has two life-centres. The ultimate goal of his life consists in transcending the lower self and in realizing the higher in intimate communion with the God-head, in sharing in his love-life in the supra cosmic realm. This can be achieved through self-dedication, devotion, love and worship. Due to the Incarnation of the Lord on earth this attainment is made possible here and now. It is not a state of annihilation or extinction. It is the regaining of a new life in a new atmosphere. It is, to be sure, a state of perfect calmness, but being the realization of a fuller life its essential character consists in growth without interruption as a partner in the march of the dialectical love expression of the Gid-head. Kriṣṇadas, a contemporary follower of Śrī Jīva, writes that God is full and perfect in his Love and has no room to grow but it is a mystery that He grows without cessation. The devotees who share in this love-life of the "sweet" Lord, also grow for all time that knows no ending. This growth consists in the expansion and the deepening of love for God and his creatures and in the heightening of the joy of communion with the ultimate source of all.

SUMMARY

Baladeva, the author of the celebrated Govinda Bhāṣya, and a follower of the school of Śrī Jīva, summarizes his philosophy in nine propositions.

1. God is the Supreme Substance.
2. He is known through all the revelation.
3. The world is real.
4. The differences are real.
5. The individual monads are real.
6. There are various grades of monads.
7. Liberation is the attainment of God.
8. The means to it is the worship of God.
9. There are three ways of knowing—experience, reasoning, and revelation.

HYDE PARK PRINTING CO. CHICAGO